

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 11-20 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the new claims. For instance, support for the new claims appears e.g. at page 4 and the original claims of the application.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

While applicant does not agree with the rejection, the new claims include the claim language recommended in the Office Action. It is thus believed the rejection has been obviated.

Claims 1-5 and 6-10 were separately rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection is traversed.

The claims presented herein fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 and represent patentable subject matter. This is made clear e.g. by the Board's recent decision *Ex parte Lundgren*, Appeal No. 003-2088 (copy enclosed).

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Xerox Reference Guide (February 2000).

While Applicant disagrees with the rejection, new independent claim 11 has been amended to recite subject matter of former claim 3 which was not rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over the Xerox document, and new independent claim 14 has been amended to recite subject matter of former claim 8 which was not rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over the Xerox document.

New independent claim 17 calls for wafer stepper equipment, which equipment is not mentioned in the Xerox document.

In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Xerox Reference Guide (February 2000).

New independent claim 11 as amended herein recites subject matters of former claims 3 and 5, and claim 5 was not rejected under Section 103 over the Xerox document alone.

Similarly, independent claim 14 as amended herein recites subject matters of claims 8 and 10, and claim 10 was not rejected under Section 103 over the Xerox document alone.

New independent claim 17 calls for wafer stepper equipment, which equipment is not mentioned in the Xerox document.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Xerox Reference Guide (February 2000) in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 6601159). The rejection is traversed.

The skilled worker would have had no particular incentive to so carefully combine select portions of the Xerox document and the smith patent as proposed in the Office Action.

Moreover, the cited documents clearly do not suggest the combination recited in new independent claims 11 and 14, i.e. in claim 11:

a simulation engine that comprises hardware and/or software that takes a desired result as an input and outputs at least one parameter setting for operating equipment to achieve a desired result;

a consumable knowledge base that comprises hardware and/or software that takes as input at least one parameter setting for operating equipment to achieve a desired result, and outputs a consumable selection for use in the equipment to achieve a desired result;

a configuration file for storing the desired result, a reference to the equipment, the at least one parameter setting and the consumable selection; and

a process step configurator, the process step configurator receiving the desired result, the at least one parameter setting and the consumable selection and outputting a step-by-step process for achieving a desired result,

wherein the system is in communication with the equipment and the system communicates the at least one parameter setting to the equipment for setting the equipment according to the at least one parameter.

Still further, the cited documents are directed to copier system. Those documents provide no suggestion of a wafer stepper as recited in new claims 13, 15 and 17-20.

In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is believed that the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Trefonas
U.S.S.N. 10/035,996
Page 8

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Corless', with a stylized, cursive script.

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
(617) 439-4444